DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 437 SP 030 855

AUTHOR Lesko, Nancy
TITLE Conceptualizing Teacher Engagement.
INSTITUTION National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, Madison, WI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 86
GRANT OERI-G-86-007
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; Interaction Process Analysis; Organizational Climate; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Curriculum; *Student Characteristics; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Engagement

ABSTRACT

This paper develops a working definition of teacher engagement, a definition based upon an understanding of how underlying assumptions about the goals of teaching affect what and whom teachers are engaged with, as well as how researchers' conceptions of proper power and authority in the school context influence what they see. Different dimensions of teaching that commonly remain in separate research traditions as discrete sets of teacher behaviors are integrated, e.g., teacher decision-making, classroom mangement, and curricular innovations. A number of assumptions guide this exploration of engagement among teachers. It is assumed that there is no one best way to be an engaged teacher, and a number of conceptions of teaching and learning are examined. The main body of the paper focuses upon the definition and interaction of the three main components--teachers, students, and the curriculum. Salient features of the secondary school milieu are examined and the conception of teacher, students, and curriculum are examined in four different images of education: discipline-centered, process-oriented, technical, and holistic. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303437

SP

CONCEPTUALIZING TEACHER ENGAGEMENT

Nancy Lesko
University of Wisconsin-Madison

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. M. Newman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was prepared at the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison which is supported in part by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No. OERI-G-86-007). The opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the views of this agency or the U.S. Department of Education.

SP030855

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The term "engagement" gains increased currency as a positive descriptor of active involvement in learning on the part of teachers and students (e.g. Sizer 1984; Powell, Farrar and Cohen 1985; Boyer 1983; Goodlad 1984). There is a tacit agreement that engaged teachers are an important component of good schools. However, the term remains undefined, appropriating users' commonsense categories of what an engaged teacher looks and acts like, as if in a particular situation, all educators could identify an engaged from a disengaged teacher. Such an assumed agreement evaporates when one examines either empirical or conceptual literature on teachers who are actively involved and committed in their work. 'Engagement' as one neatly observable, identifiable entity, or set of behaviors, is only sustained in isolation from literature on teachers.

The literature on teachers is disjointed because of separate traditions of research, disparate assumptions about normative standards of practice, and variation in practice due to the different goals teachers themselves perceive to be worth working toward. In this paper I develop a working definition of engagement, a definition based upon an understanding of how underlying assumptions about the goals of teaching affect what and whom teachers are engaged with, as well as how researchers' conceptions of proper power and authority in the school context influence what they see. Additionally, I work to integrate different dimensions of teaching that commonly remain in separate research traditions and as discrete sets of teacher behaviors, e.g. teacher decision-making, classroom management, and curricular innovations.

A number of assumptions guide this exploration of engagement among

teachers. First, I assume that there is no one-best-way to be an engaged teacher, and I attempt to examine a number of conceptions of teaching and learning. Second, I seek to avoid contributing to either of two stereotypes of teachers, the "myth of altruism" (Lipsky 1980), a romantic view of good teachers as selflessly devoted to students (Lightfoot 1983) or teachers as powerless victims of social forces (Lightfoot 1983). I also avoid using "engagement" as a veil for increasing the accountability of teachers or further intensifying the demands made of them (Grant 1983; Eggleston 1979). This paper attempts to establish a narrow path between a romantic, idealized view of teaching and a deficient, blaming one to examine teaching as work that occurs in structured settings, with certain pre-conceptions and motivations, with students who bring their own ideas, and within district and school curricular demands.

Further, I do not conceive of teachers' actions as synonymous with learning (Tom 1984), so it is possible that even the most engaged teacher might not bring about learning in her students. Rather, teaching is dynamic, interactive, and cannot be assumed to lead necessarily to specifiable outcomes in individuals or in groups of students. For the time being, I conceive of engagement as action, movement, transformation of the relationships among teacher and students and between students and the formal curriculum. An engaged teacher may be as influenced by her students and her interactions with the curriculum as her students are by her. Engagement is not seen as part of a one-way movement of knowledge from teacher to student. In asserting this, I place myself in the ends-oriented view of teaching, not among those who examine and evaluate teaching behaviors as ends in themselves (Tom 1984).

To conceive of engaged teaching as interactive and dynamic necessitates a study of teachers, students, the curriculum, and the milieu in which the

interactions among the three take place (Schwab 1973 cited in Tom 1984). "Defensible educational thought must take account of [these] four commonplaces of equal rank" (Tom 1984:10). Accordingly, this paper discusses each of the four. Thus, the paper explores teacher engagement by asking with what and with whom are teachers engaged? How are they involved with each? What is the nature of the classroom milieu in which the interactions take place? This paper focuses upon the classroom as the primary milieu of teacher's work for engagement must be sustained within classrooms.

The main body of this paper focuses upon the definition and interaction of the three components--teacher, students, and the curriculum. After a brief review of salient features of the secondary school classroom milieu, I examine the conception of teachers, students, and curriculum in four different images of education: discipline-centered, process-oriented, technical, and wholistic images of good education. As the conception of the teacher, learner, and curriculum vary, so will the order of priorities and the 'proper' interactions among components change. Thus, what and whom teachers are engaged with will vary with the image of eduucation held by the practicing teacher. Different images of education will emphasize teachers' engagement with different entities, from test scores and standardization to individual intellectual growth. I conclude the review by assessing what forms of engagement are likely to be fostered within each image of education.

A CONCEPTION OF ENGAGEMENT

A triadic conception of teaching grounds this paper. That is, teaching is an interaction of teacher, students, and subject matter. I think of the classroom as a dynamic triangle, with teacher, students, and curriculum each occupying an angle, as in the diagram below. The particular dynamics of the teacher, students, and curriculum are likely to vary according to the

perceived goal of education, the understanding of how learning proceeds and the conception of what is important knowledge. The possibilities created or missed are a result of the interactions of teacher, students, and subject matter within the context of a dominant vision of 'real' education.

Relevant research on the interrelations of teachers, students, and curriculum is thin, so the interactions described here remain largely hypothetical. The specialization among educational research fields such as curriculum theory and development, teacher thinking, and classroom management has suppressed a more wholistic, integrated approach to classroom interactions.

Engagement can be conceived of as the characterand outcomes of the on-going relations among the students, the teacher, and the curriculum. The relation is characterized by movement, action; it is not likely to be a static relation. Nor is the relation adequately conceived as movement that is uni-directional or linear. Interactions are certainly bi-directional (Glick 1968) and likely even more complex. Engagement can be seen as authentic interactions among participants (the curriculum is included as a participant) such that possibilities are created (Davies 1984:3). Engagement is the

interaction of parts, the movement of parts in relation to one another that cause thoughtfulness, seeing of greater complexity, or a light bulb to go on. Alienation, or estrangement, of students and teachers would also be dynamic and interactive, but not generative in that options would narrow, complexity become simple, or multiplicity of ideas would be seen less often. Engagement creates possibilities.

Engagement as the creation of possibilities lends itself to consideration both in the short term and in the long-term. One or two classes might show certain patterns of student and teacher interactions with the subject, but interactions might be different when examined across an entire year. A particular image of education might afford teachers and students numerous possibilities across a short period of time yet be quite deadening and restrictive over a school year or over a number of years.

Thus, engagement is a creative process through which ideas and actions are generated and generative. Educational engagement is affected by the image of the curriculum, the teacher, and students that is held; the conceptions of the curriculum, of teachers, and of students are in turn affected by engagement or disengagement. However, engagement is not visible simply by asking teachers to discuss their conceptions of curriculum, of teachers' role, or of students' learning needs. Rather, engagement is present in the on-going relations or connections among the three components of the classroom. Engagement is visible in the way teachers and students talk and think together, in the way students talk with peers over their school work, in the pattern of teacher talk and thought about students and curriculum. So, it is to the interactions, the classroom processes that I now turn.

The study of the sets of on-going relations among teacher, student, and curriculum as they create or destroy possibilities is not easily approached

through clearly defined categories. It is far simpler to limit debate to the more isolatable entities of the curriculum or images of students and to consider them in static ways. I venture these initial steps in the direction of integrating the three dimensions of classroom teaching and learning by discussing 1) Teacher-student relations, 2) Pedagogical practices and 3) Teachers' relations with the organization of teaching. In effect, I am separately considering the relations among the angles of the triadic model of the classroom.

1. Teacher-student relations

Many conceptual and empirical studies of teachers assert that the core of the teacher's identity lies in the relation between teacher and student, specifically between the teacher's instruction and student learning (Lortie 1975; Waller 1965; Jackson 1968). Even though this may be the case in the ideal, the teacher severely affected by institutional constraints may begin in practice to withdraw her energies from the teacher-student relation or from her/his relation to certain students (Keddie 1977). Lipsky (1980) argues that the paradox of social service workers is that human interaction with clients is the very heart of their job, but since the job is situated in a bureaucracy, the relationship with the clients may be easily subordinated to bureaucratic reason and routine.

The source of the teacher's identity and pride, a productive relation with students, is seriously undermined in four ways by the taken-for-granted structure of schools. First, the teacher sees only a part of the student, for example the cognitive abilities as seen in only a math or science class. Second, the teacher has no control over the final outcome of his instruction in the sense that contact with the student is too short, with too little intensity, but also in the sense that many worthwhile goals of education are

likely to be integrated and acted upon only over time in a youth's life. Third, the teacher does not control the raw material, the student as she/he enters the classroom; the teacher cannot control the socio-economic background, the academic training, the quality of home life, the mental health, or the diet of the student Fourth, the teacher does not control the work pace; district curriculum guides determine what material is "to be covered," tradition sets 50 minutes as the right concentration time per subject, and interrruptions such as announcements further affect the instructional pace. Thus, the core of teaching and teachers' identity is under assault within the school structure. That the relation of teacher to student is estranged to begin with should be kept in mind throughout this discussion.

An engaged teacher is likely to establish satisfactory relationships with a wide variety of students, both slow and bright, although relations with some students might be only respectful and adequate, rather than exciting and deep. Tom (1984) suggests that different kinds of relationships are necessary to engage different kinds of students although he fails to elaborate. A more wholistic approach appears necessary with disaffected students (Wehlage et al. 1980). All the teachers in Raphael's (1985) account "love the kids," first and last, even after fifteen or more years of teaching. Part of what these teachers love is learning from students; they see classroom interactions as reciprocal.

> The kids teach you a terrific amount. And that's what's fun, when there are so many things that come the other way (Raphael 1985:74).

Elbaz (1983) found that a high school English teacher viewed teaching as a

"window" on the students, allowing her to see their thoughts and how they were responding to different subjects. But the perspective through the window appears to change over the years. Teachers describe a change from being a "hip, groovy" teacher who relates to kids on their level to one most interested in getting them to think (Raphael 1985:55). Thus, the nature of the engaged teacher-student relation will vary with the years in the classroom; intensity remains but the emphasis changes.

A theme that runs through interviews with involved teachers is a vision of some kind of equality with students, a moral equality (Tom 1984) or an equality based upon thoughtfulness about one's world (Raphael 1985). Tom (1984) argues that the decision about the nature of the student-teacher relationship is a moral one (one in which there is concern for the rightness of actions) because the relationship is an unequal one in that the teacher controls the situation and has been given responsibility for the development of the students. It follows that an engaged teacher might have a relationship with students, that although not consciously moral, would treat students as if they had certain rights in his/her classroom. Such relations with students might be expressed as equality. It is possible that teachers who see themselves as equals of students, see students in more complex, interactive ways (Bussis et al. 1976). In direct contrast, the alienated teacher might wield power over students for its own sake, rather than for educational ends. This might be visible in excessive discipline or brow-beating of students when a reprimand would appear sufficient. Such use of a teacher's power is likely to negatively affect classroom possibilities.

An engaged teacher is likely to be sensitive to an equal treatment of students. When researchers focus upon different students' views of high school (Cusick 1974; Lesko 1983; Wehlage, Stone, and Kliebard 1980); they find

a highly developed sensitivity to preferential treatment. Students who witness constant favoritism toward some students (commonly athletes or socio-economic elites) are likely to distance themselves from trying or from that teacher or from school in general. The comprehensive high school may have established that internal favoritism on a building-wide level. According to Powell et al. (1985) the great mass of high school students get no attention from teachers; they are just numbers. The school has segregated the exceptional students (gifted and special education) who garner teachers' attention. Powell et al. document the cost of this system for students. It is likely to be just as devastating for teachers, who fail to connect personally with the mass of students.

With the increasing proportion of minority students in urban schools, many of whom may come from families without positive experiences with schools, the relationship with the non-minority teacher may be an increasingly important dimension of students' persistence in school. The impact of cultural conflict (between students and schools) on school achievement has been well-documented for Native Americans (Philips 1983), for Hawaiians (Au and Jordan 1981), and for blacks (Heath 1983). Teachers 'read' certain behavioral signs from students that tell them that the instruction is understood, appreciated, and meaningful. Students coming into first grade vary not only in their exposure to reading, books, etc., but to white, middle-class patterns of interaction and deference. Minority students may want to learn very badly, but somehow do not give the signals to teachers that they are competent or interested. Teachers may accept the likelihood of minority failure. At the secondary level, this could be communicated through easy assignments that are quickly finished, and that are very different from what average students in the school are expected to do, or by subtle comments about

students' lack of achievement (Wehlage et al. 1980). The engaged teacher will not be able to overcome cultural differences, but may be working to find solutions for pedagogical problems with minority students.

The teacher-student relationship can be considered from many perspectives and is multi-sided and complex. It is considered as the central relation in teaching, yet teachers work in situations where that priority is not upheld. Disengaged or alienated teachers are less likely to hold that relation with students as central, or they may emphasize it only for certain students (e.g. college-bound). Engaged teachers are likely to see students in a more complex way, as multi-dimensional rather than as manifesting only aptitude or motivation (Bussis et al. 1976). Engaged teachers are more likely to change their views of students across time (Brophy and Good 1984) and to see learning as bi-directional based upon a view of students as equal, or adult-like in some way. The involved teacher is likely to avoid preferential treatment in the classroom and of culturally biased practices and content. I would anticipate an overall high level of self-awareness of classroom actions and of articulation of thoughts on his/her relation with students among engaged teachers.

2. Pedagogical practices

Pedagogical practices are the relation of the teacher, student, and curriculum. From many educators' perspective, pedagogical practices are the heart of schooling. This may account for the existence of a more substantive and broader body of research on curriculum and pedagogy.

Whether the teacher brings personal knowledge into the classroom appears to distinguish alienated from engaged teachers. By this I mean that the teacher does not merely plod through the term, "covering the material but not seeing or hearing" (Grant 1983). McNeil (1983) found teachers who had removed

all traces of themselves, personal meaning and feelings, from what they did. Good elementary teachers of both high and low achieving students shared their personal knowledge in teaching--they told students about personal experiences with understanding things and asked students for their personal experience with topics. For example, when they read a story about a picnic, the teacher asked each student what type of picnic they liked best. This seems like a simple act, yet such minimal personalization is absent from many classrooms (Lesko 1986).

The engaged teacher is one likely to be thoughtful and to bring about throughtfulness in the students' relation with subject matter. Schrag's (1986) exploration of thinking in education proposes that thoughtful teachers will devise academic tasks for students that have a degree of intrinsic motivation and autonomy, require collaboration, and result in a product which has the "signature of its makers" (Schrag 1986:chp 3). A number of points important for long-term creation of possibilities are embedded in Schrag's work. Students collaborate, thus an engaged teacher sees learning not steming just from knowledge being passed from teacher to student. The use of intrinsic motivation suggests a certain view of students, not as children, but as reasoning beings for whom academic work can be exciting and rewarding.

Grant (1983) writes that teachers are "exhausted;" their resources are depleted because the social authority of teaching has diminished, i.e. more students and parents question the ends and means of schools. Consequently, teachers must rely on their personal resources to win over each class of students and the imbalance of heavy giving with little sense of appreciation, support, or gratitude leads to exhaustion. If students are less automatically believing in teachers, the creation of academic products allow both teachers and students to see a concrete example of accomplishment, achievement which is

not visible in daily worksheets. School assemblies in which students perform, science fairs, or written projects like newspapers all provide important, and otherwise elusive, concrete accomplishments to teachers and students. The presence of such concrete products in a teacher's repertoire probably indicates engagement. The creation of a product is an important idea for long-term teacher engagement.

Another indicator of engagment is having a lot of ideas of things one wants to do, and really caring that they are accomplished. A veteran high school science teacher of twenty-one years proclaimed: "I decided a powerful person was one who had ideas to implement" (Raphael 1985:75). Another teacher with fifteen years experience talked about how she never reached the "perfect" teaching style, she always found ways to improve. Another experienced teacher continually tinkered with his work: sometimes he was too loose with a class, sometimes too tight (Raphael 1985). These teachers are saying that they are thinking about teaching, criticizing their own work, and consistently attempting to improve. Engaged teachers have ideas, 'Next year I'll do that differently.'

A theme raised in Raphael's (1985) interviews with teachers and in Elbaz's study of a high school English teacher is the attention among teachers to school rhythms, to <u>time</u> in teaching. The teacher whom Elbaz (1983) studied was explicit that her basic planning framework arose from the school schedule. Early in the year, certain kinds of work is best, with easier tasks and topics before vacations. Really exciting work is important to schedule during the long unbroken stretches of school, and really hard tasks were carefully sequenced with other kinds of work at optimal times. Teachers were aware of the ups and downs of the school year, taking both their own and students' energies into consideration.

Raphael's (1985) and Elbaz's (1983) teachers made changes in their extended careers. They changed grade level, or courses, or schools. One teacher changed schools many times until she found one she could work in. Sarah changed from an isolated English teacher to one involved in a team collaboration and then moved on to direct an individualized English lab. As Elbaz follows her across time, Sarah's views of what was worthwhile to teach, how students learn, and what situation was optimal for her all evolved. Elbaz's study is interesting for her description of the non-linear, slow transformation of Sarah's ideas and practices. Change, probably supported by a cohort of peers, is likely to be a mark of an engaged teacher.

Engaged teachers may have a messianic glint in their eyes. For example, Raphael's interviewee wanted to "turn everyone on to biology" (1985:57). Another science teacher said:

> I like to think that everybody that's been in my class has had a change in themselves as a result....They have another view of the biological world, another view of the environment....And maybe another view of themselves (Raphael 1985:69).

The words are different, but these teachers are creating possibilities in the relations between students and the curriculum.

3. Teachers' relations with the organization of teaching

The third set of relations which are central in the creation of possibilities in the classroom are the teacher's relation to the overall organization of teaching, by which I mean the setting of educational aims, discussion of courses and programs that embody those aims, interactions with other teachers over goals and methods, and involvement in program and teacher

evaluation. Within the classroom, the relation to the organization of teaching includes the development of a particular viewpoint (as opposed to teaching the text's 'neutrality') the development of one own's materials, and revising one's goals and methods in light of insights gained in the classroom, emerging beliefs, and further education. Creativity in the thinking about and in actual teaching is another dimension of the relation to the organization of teaching (The previous section on pedagogical practices elaborates on some of these specifics).

An engaged teacher would likely participate in some way in the establishing of educational policy in their school or district. This could take many forms: committee work, school board participation, union activity. Of course, such outside work can be an escape from the classroom, so such involvement by itself does not indicate engagement. But teachers may find it necessary to protect their creative possibilities within the classroom by involvement in broader educational deliberations.

Within the classroom, the engaged teacher will demonstrate creativity in content and/or methods of teaching. An integration of material into a form readily approachable by students could be one manifestation; innovative methods for teaching required content would be another. The creativity would show in some interesting presentation or organization of some magnitude greater than one lesson. The engaged teacher would likely demonstrate an ongoing revision of her/his teaching; this is often a slow evolution and change of one dimension at a time, rather than a total revamping.

Having investigated three important sets of relations involved in classroom teaching and learning, I want to summarize what this brief review reveals about likely classroom relations of engaged teachers. Teacher engagement was defined as the construction of the teacher-student-curriculum

relations that lead to the creation of further possibilities.

Summary of Relations of Engagement

1. Teacher-Student Relations

A. Engaged teachers are likely to have relations with students that are respectful and in some way treat students as equals, for example, in trusting them, in high expectations, in serious, pertinent course content, in working together to answer questions. This "courteous" stance toward students will likely exist with all students, though probably vary in nature or degree.

B. A teacher will likely endeavor to know students and have classmates know each other to promote reciprocal learning in class.

C. The teacher will likely have a complex view of students, including socioeconomic background, motivation, interests, self-confidence, academic achievement level, and social development. The engaged teacher will less frequently use reductive labels such as "lazy" in describing students.

D. The teacher is likely to hold good relations with students as an important end and as a means to other ends. This teacher will be sensitive to the impact of her/his actions on relations with students and among students.

E. The engaged teacher will likely be concerned with the immediate needs of students or the longer term ones. The students' good will figure into her/his thinking and teaching.

2. Pedagogical Practices

A. The engaged teacher will be personally involved with students in learning. That is, the teacher will not remove himself from active participation as a human being with students. A teacher will not "hide" behind the subject matter, nor assume an authoritarian distance, nor some other ploy that minimizes human interactions with students.

B. The engaged teacher will demonstrate a thoughtfulness about her/his

work and be concerned with students' thinking.

C. The engaged teacher will likely be sensitive to and plan for up and cdown times of the school year.

D. The engaged teacher may intensely believe and want certain goals for students.

E. The engaged teacher with many years experience (e.g. over eight) may have changed schools, courses, or positions in order to remain 'fresh.'

3. Teachers' Relation to the Organization of Teaching

A. The engaged teacher is likely to be involved in educational policy discussions or implementation at the school or district level.

B. Within the classroom, the engaged teacher is likely to express some creativity in teaching content and/or pedagogy. This may take numerous forms, but will probably be seen in a unique 'stamp,' for example, in developing materials or integrating supplemental materials in a particular way.

I have conceptualized engaged teaching as dynamic, complex, on-going interactions among the teacher, students, and the curriculum. I have summarized literature on each of the three sets of relations, or processes, of this triadic model: teacher-student relations, pedagogical practices, and the teacher's relation to the organization of teaching. I move to a brief discussion of the secondary classroom milieu, something all teachers, regardless of their educational goals, have in common. After that I investigate competing images of education in order to examine which images may foster greater and lesser degrees of active teacher involvement with students and the curriculum.

THE SECONDARY CLASSROOM MILIEU

Although much important and relevant work exists on the broader school-

wide context and structure affecting classroom work (e.g. Metz 1978, 1986; Lipsky 1980; Cusick 1976; Powell et al. 1985) , space necessitates a narrower focus on the classroom milieu. Several features of public secondary school classrooms are clearly salient for a discussion of engagement. First is the number of students: in general teachers interact with 25 to 30 students at one time. Second, those students are not voluntarily present, but are legally required to attend. A third factor of the milieu is the belief that there should be a common school experience (although this is clearly in conflict with the belief in meritocracy and that brighter students should go faster and farther), and the resulting emphasis on a standardized formal curriculum. The "batch-processing" of students (Cusick 1976) makes keeping order a major necessity (Cusick 1983; McNeil 1986; Metz 1978). Order amidst large numbers of students is problematic and a source of much teacher worry. Subject-matter specialization means that teachers instruct students in one subject, typically for 50 minutes each day. Thus, the milieu in which teachers, students, and curriculum meet is a busy one, filled with large classes, many classes, problems of order, involuntary students, and few personal interactions between teacher and student. This general pattern changes only for students who are designated exceptional and receive more of the institution's resources (Powell et al. 1985).

The high school curriculum is a many-headed monster with no coherence, integrity, or direction (Powell et al. 1985; Sizer 1984). The ability to offer a wide diversity of courses is heralded as a strength, but the failure to integrate across courses or departments leaves that burden to the students, who may make little sense of the high school education except as a rite of passage or social setting. Lack of direction through a coherent educational philosophy other than meeting diverse student needs (Cusick 1983), leaves many

of the educational policy decisions in the hands of teachers who decide what they will teach and expect of students. Especially at the secondary level, teachers still maintain substantial autonomy and substantial isolation in curricular and pedagogical decisions (Cusick 1983; D. Hargreaves 1980; Elbaz 1983), though movements to competency-based education, behavioral objectives, and high school exit exams are making inroads on this traditional autonomy.

Teacher autonomy has assets and liabilities. Given the uncertainty of educational processess (Lortie 1975; Jackson 1968; Lampert 1984; Metz 1978), the isolation of the teacher insulates her against criticisms. It also minimizes disagreements among staff members who are likely to hold widely divergent views on teaching and learning (D. Hargreaves 1980; Metz 1978). However, it also obstructs learning from others, sharing difficulties and successes with peers, and garnering support from colleagues. Since peers are the major reference group for teachers (Lipsky 1980; Lortie 1975), minimized contact and conversation about ongoing classroom work (except in the most superficial way, for example, in the telling of atrocity stories about unruly students) entails loss of support and individual reliance on learning-by-one's own mistakes. Failures will appear to be individualized and successes may go unrecognized. Excessive autonomy may minimize divisiveness but it also maximizes isolation and lack of help or recognition. Consequently, teachers are thrown upon their own personal resources--psychological, emotional, intellectual, moral, and technical.

Another significant dimension of the teaching milieu is its location within a bureaucracy, a factor that has great impact on teachers' commitment to their work and to their students (Weber; Lipsky 1980). Even though education is basically a human-interacting-with-human endeavor (surveys such as Lortie's corroborate the meaning of teaching being in close and successful

relations with students), the processes take place in and through a bureaucracy, the defining characteristic of which is detachment from individual or personal motivations, personalities, and interests (Lipsky 1980); the bureaucratic ideal is impersonal equality of treatment (Weber 1946). Any human model of interaction underlying education is substantively distorted or compromised by the demands of bureacracy. Teachers must navigate a course through the conflicting demands of educating individual students and being a social service bureaucrat (Lipsky 1980).

One final characteristic of the educational milieu must be noted, an extension of the bureaucratic-personal tension. The classroom milieu presents "unresolvable dual obligations" (Lampert 1984). This means that teachers are in situations in which they have responsibilities both to individual students and to their school or district to teach the agreed-upon curriculum. These two responsibilities conflict for teaching "to the group" very often is not in the best interest of students who need more individual attention or who would benefit by a different curricular approach. Berlak and Berlak (1981), Elbaz (1983), Varenne and Kelly (1976) and Lampert (1984) elucidate teachers' dilemmas and competing temporary and partial resolutions. The important point is that competing responsibilities and principles are a primary fact of teaching. Some choices are more likely to lead to increased engagement of teachers and students, while others increase alienation (Wehlage, Stone, and Kliebard 1980).

In this section on the classroom milieu I highlighted several features.

1. The size and involuntary nature of secondary school classrooms means that there is a great emphasis on keeping order, which further diminishes student-teacher interaction over learning.

2. Teachers have significant amounts of autonomy in their teaching in

the fact that no one watches what they do except their students. Teaching is isolated work, which allows them protection from criticism.

3. Teaching takes place in a bureaucratic setting that structures certain alienations into the work. Teachers control some decisions, but in general have little control over the conditions under which they work with students. The major tension is between serving the rationalized bureaucratic order which often undermines the educational needs of students. As bureaucrats, teachers may need to develop an appearance of responding to all students, but they are making differential resource allottments. Teachers may feel the pretense of their position.

4. Classroom teaching involves unresolvable dual obligations, e.g. to individual students and to the district. In whatever manner teachers temporarily resolve the responsibilities, residues of the unattended obligation remain. Only over time, with effort and thought, do teachers move toward more adequate, more inclusive, resolutions.

IMAGES OF EDUCATION

Although the classroom characteristics described in the last section remain similar across schools, relations among the teacher, students, and the curriculum can vary substantially according to the definitions of education that undergird daily teaching. In this section, I examine four different images of education each of which encompasses a distinct view of teachers, students, and the curriculum, the elements defined as central to a dynamic, complex view of teaching. Within each view of education are assumptions about who ought to have power to make educational decisions and how the power should be distributed. Each view of education also has goals that lead toward broad or narrow possibilities. As I examine each of these images of education, I consider what possibilities for power or voice (Giroux and McLaren 1986) among

teachers and students are fostered. Do some images arise from a narrow or simplistic view of teaching and learning and thus likely to lead to few possibilities in the long-run? Are some views likely to lead teachers to exhaustion because they involve such high expectations, and thus to disengagement albeit via an alternate route? Does an image of education lead to teachers' power but leave students passive? By posing questions about the long and short-term interactions and consequences of different views, I seek to illuminate how the basic image of education in operation affects what and whom teachers are involved with. Teachers can be engaged with a curriculum, yet their teaching may not create possibilities in the overall interactions of teacher, students, and curriculum.

I will describe four images of education derived from theoretical and empirical work on teachers and schools: discipline-centered, technical, process-oriented, and wholistic. To a degree, all typologies are ideal types and real teachers will fall somewhere between categories. Nevertheless, to conceptualize engagement we must begin with how teachers conceive of their responsibilities and the students with whom they are engaged and the curriculum over which they are engaged.

A Discipline-centered image of education

I begin with discipline-centered because it is the most common and the traditional view of secondary school teaching. In this view a good education consists in a student learning to think like a mathematician, an historian, or a biologist. This image of education has a long history (Eisner and Vallance 1974) and is currently revived in proposals for school reform by Adler (1982) and Sizer (1984). Often included in this view of good education is an emphasis on the development of reason, familiarity with the cumulative intellectual traditions of Western culture, and character education. Many

spokespeople advocate one subset of this view, but the similarity among the different positions is that all are backword looking, in that what is valuable to teach and learn is found in turning to what has preceeded, to those bodies of knowledge that have historical roots and firm traditions (Giroux, Penna, and Pinar 1981).

The Teacher. The teacher in this image of education is a person steeped in, alive with the excitement and understandings of the mathematician, the historian, or the musician. The exemplary history teachers actually do history by touring Europe and investigating places relevant to their teaching. Music teachers actually conduct musical ensembles, compose, or perform themselves. The teacher's view of herself is as one who loves the subject, e.g. literature, and is able to generate excitement in students for her subject-matter specialty. The formal knowledge that such teachers transmit is narrow in breadth, but deep through specialization (Bernstein 1975).

The Curriculum. The curriculum in the discipline-centered perspective aims to initiate neophytes into the canons of the relevant traditions, typically through immersion. This perspective varies somewhat with the subject matter. For example, in English the discipline-centered approach is likely to be dominated by a "text centered orientation" (Grossman et al. 1985).

> In this orientation, one may know periods of literature, major authors within periods, and individual texts. The sources of evidence exist within the text itself and the reader may use the traditional tools of literary analysis to understand texts. Within this orientation, knowledge of literature might

> be organized chronologically, by period, by author, or by genre. (Grossman et al. 1985: 7)

This view may be modified in practice. One secondary English teacher, Sarah, had multiple conceptions of literature, e.g. as an academic discipline to which she had an obligation, but also a view of English literature centered on the experience of the student who is to be "opened up" (Elbaz 1983). Elbaz asserts that Sarah did not have a clearly articulated general conception of literature as a discipline, a fact that was related to the necessity of being a mediary between literature and her students. Elbaz summarizes Sarah's perspective:

> Her primary concern in English was with the possibilities offered by a literary text for engaging students' interests and for offering them a vehicle through which to reflect on and enrich their own experience.... She encountered difficulty only when students expressed no interest in the text and forced her into the posture of "defending literature" (Elbaz 1983:95).

Although my examples focus on English, a similar traditional view of subject-matter exists in other areas (see Eisner and Vallance 1974; Baxter et al. 1985 re: biology knowledge; Gudmundsdottir et al. 1985 re: social studies knowledge). Concisely, the discipline-centered image strives to impart the canons of the discipline to students, for example, the standards of judgment of good science or good literature, through experience with the 'sacred' texts, and through familiarity with prevailing theories or lines of inquiry or criticism. As noted, this is the ideal definition and practices of discipline-centered teachers may vary.

Students. The discipline-centered teacher views students as raw materials needing to be shaped, developed, and steeped in the specialty tradition. Students are an audience for the traditional knowledge performed or displayed for them by the teacher. Students are likely treated respectfully, as future scholars in the field. But there is always a sense of students' appreciation of literature, or classical music, or the wonders of science. As Elbaz noted (above), Sarah's could mediate between literature and students as long as students expressed an interest, i.e. valued her knowledge or acted like they did.

Distribution of Power. The sacred knowledge confers authority and status on the holder of that knowledge (Bernstein 1975). Teachers hold power according to their degree of expertise, expertise bolstered by more subject-matter knowledge. This explains the phenomenon of secondary teachers valuing further education primarily in their subject matter. (D.Hargreaves 1980). The holders and developers of sacred knowledge hold power. Teachers really knowledgable in their areas will hold power and students who aspire to scholarship in the field will also be accorded higher status. But power is only available to students if they are willing to be passive receivers of knowledge.

Process-Oriented Image of Education

A second perspective on education can be termed a process-oriented approach for its assumptions that learning is personal and the learner must be actively involved. This orientation emphasizes the personal meaning-making dimension of learning, and the inherently individualistic, if not unique, nature of education (contrast this with the discipline-centered view that brings the younger generation into the shared society and culture of the learned). Examples of this perspective are the National Writing Project (Gray

and Myers 1978), forms of "open education" (Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel 1976) and any strongly child-centered teaching (Caulkins 1982). Teachers who hold this view may teach from where the students are (Metz 1978).

The Teacher. Under this conception, the teacher is seen as the arbiter of appropriate knowledge and pedagogy because of her training and her knowledge of her students. Some proponents of this image refer to the teacher as a "teacher-researcher," for the teacher must engage in inquiry, "understanding, explaining, and predicting people's behavior in their social milieux" (Tikunoff and Mergendoller 1983:212). The goal of such inquiry is the resolution of instructional problems. The National Writing Project is a nation-wide program to improve the teaching of writing at all grade levels and in all content areas through teacher training institutes. A process approach to writing is central to this project, that is, emphasis on prewriting, writing, and revising. However, the National Writing Project has a second goal that aims to change the status of teachers through developing and acknowledging their expertise. Gomez cites the second goal:

> to redefine the professional and institutional roles of K-12 teachers so that the stimulation of inquiry and acknowledged expertise can be restored to K-12 teaching (Gomez 1985:2).

Thus, among the explicit assumptions of the project is an elaboration of the view of teachers as the source of knowledge on teaching.

> BAWP [Bay Area Writing Project] is built upon the recognition that there are outstanding teachers of writing in the schools. These teachers are themselves sources of knowledge about the teaching of writing, knowledge of a

> different sort from that found in the books of composition theory, knowledge gained by the successes and failures of day-to-day classroom experience. These teachers can be identified, brought together to share what each of them individually had discovered, and be exposed to the theoretical knowledge that does exist. Thus trained, these teachers of writing become the best teachers of other teachers: best because their information has stood the test of time and is presented in practical terms that other teachers can translate directly into lessons for their students (Gomez 1985:4).

Teachers are seen as the source of important practical wisdom on teaching writing. Knowledge is developed and passed on by them; they are not mere conduits for some traditional knowledge that has accumulated before their time.

The Curriculum. The interactive relationship between the learner and the material is of prime concern here. Education is synonymous with the dynamics of learning. This approach does not deal with specific content, and can be described as content-independent. The curriculum is open-ended, since given the appropriate intellectual tools, students could grow almost indefinitely. Eisner and Vallance describe the process orientation as follows:

> The problem of the educator and curriculum specialist, then, is to identify the most salient and efficient intellectual processes through which learning occurs and to provide

> the setting and structure for their development. Education is seen as an impartial enabling mechanism (Eisner and Vallance 1974:6).

Student meaning-making is often central to this perspective, for example, in the writing process taught in the National Writing Project. A developmental perspective meshes with and reinforces this perspective, in that the point of the curriculum is to promote individual intellectual, moral, social, and emotional development.

The Students. Students are viewed as much more active in this perspective. Education is personal, and there is no education apart from students' creation of meaning in relation to the curriculum. Students are seen in numerous categories, from single character traits to a complex of them.[1]

Distribution of Power. In this process view, both students and teachers are the central actors, not conduits or receptables of knowledge. Only when knowledge has meaning for students and promotes their intellectual growth is it important knowledge. Teachers are closest to the students and are the best judges of appropriate methods and content for their students. Thus, people who hold this perspective often re-name teachers as teacher-researchers. The National Writing Project most clearly demonstrates the emphasis on teachers as primary sources of expert knowledge. There is a clear emphasis in this perspective on empowering teachers. One way is to honor, to canonize their practical wisdom. Many of the writers and researchers in this tradition aim to raise the status of the classroom folk wisdom of teachers, as one way of moving toward a professional status.

This perspective emphasizes individual development only; it has no conception of education to promote social responsibilities, though it is

likely to do much for individual reasoning and creativity. As Eisner and Vallance (1974) note, the approach is content-independent. There are no content "givens." The approach is more open-ended and able to accomodate many kinds of knowledge within its rationale. For example, therapeutic discussions would be a legitimate part of social studies or English classes.

The Technical Image of Education

The technical approach is based upon a belief in rational curriculum planning that will lead to efficient, standardized learning. Underlying this approach is the image of education from a systems analysis, i.e. as sets of inputs, processes, and outputs, in which--following the model of manufacturers of other goods--if educators clearly specify treatments (lessons) and standardize educational inputs, the educational products will have higher quality and uniformity. I follow other researchers in calling this approach 'technical' (Eisner and Vallance 1974; Bullough et al. 1984; Popkewitz et al. 1982) for it takes the aims of education as given, typically the textbook is the curriculum, and it believes the educational problem is to tinker with the methodology and timing, etc. to achieve the greatest learning.

The Curriculum. Educators holding this view conceptualize the "function of curriculum as essentially one of finding efficent means to a set of predefined, nonproblematic ends" (Eisner and Vallance 1974:7). This approach is most concerned with the technology by which knowledge is communicated and learning is facilitated. Education becomes "information-processing" and teaching is the "planning and delivery of instruction" (Gagne 1981). The problem of curriculum becomes developing a "technology of instruction":

> The focus is less on the learner or even
> on his relationship to the material than
> on the more practical problem of efficiently

packaging and presenting the material to him

(Eisner and Vallance 1974:7).

Mastery learning is an example of this image of education (Block 1981), as is Madeline Hunter's model for effective instruction.

In Bullough, Goldstein, and Holt's (1984) study of teachers' responses to programmed instruction imposed upon them (the systems were GEMS and IGE in elementary schools), they found that for teachers, teaching had nothing to do with determining what should be taught. Teachers considered it natural and proper that others, experts, do that. Bullough et al. suggest that teachers trade the possibilities inherent in creating their own aims and approaches for the security of teaching what curriculum experts have mandated. The uncertainty that is endemic to teaching (Lortie 1975; Metz 1978; Jackson 1968) in determining what aims are worthwhile for which students, what methods are best, and how one knows if he has been effective, are 'solved' or pre-empted in the teachers' acceptance of the expert-created curriculum.

Thus, the curriculum is conceived as good when it is standardized, concise objectives and implementation are formulated, and it results in efficient covering of the material in which intellectual certainty is assumed. Intellectual certainty is easy to assume because the curriculum is often conceived in terms of rule-learning or skills. In a study of the teaching of reading and writing in an IGE elementary school, both reading and writing were operationalized as the learning of rules, e.g. rules of punctuation, verb agreement, and spelling. The communicative and social uses and functions of language were absent (Lesko 1986). Reading and writing involved the learning and automatic application of rules. Such a curriculum is also fragmented, for reading and writing are not integrated. Teaching and learning proceed best when the content is divided into small pieces and logically sequenced

(Bullough et al. 1984).

The Teacher. The teacher in this image of education is a technician, carrying out the often uniform pedagogy that has been designed by outside experts. The teacher has a conduit function (Bussis et al. 1976). The teacher can also be seen as a manager of learning, one who oversees that students proceed at appropriate rates and grade their efforts. In either term, conduit or manager, the personal interaction with the students over the curriculum is deemphasized, if not invisible. Teachers do not have to know their students, excite them about learning, question them, but simply administer the "instruments of education" (Tom 1984:147). The teacher is not the source of knowledge about teaching craft, nor the active inquirer into which students learn best under different conditions, nor a link between the student and the Western cultural tradition in the form of history or literature. The teacher is an intermediary, a functionary, between curriculum developers and students, a bureaucrat who implements policies created by superiors.

The Students. The students are viewed as receptacles for educational bits and pieces (Tom 1984). They are often discussed as 'learners,' emphasizing only the cognitive dimension. Students' progress can be adequately assessed by test scores (Bullough et al. 1984). And in valuing the efficient, standardized curriculum, students unable to learn at the pre-ordained pace will be at a great disadvantage. The technical image of education may place greater blame for students' failure to learn on schedule with the home. It is possible that such views of students and families may legitimate earlier intervention.

Distribution of Power. The power to make decisions about educational aims and methods is allotted to the outside expert, who is not a classroom

teacher (Popkewitz et al.1982; Bullough et al. 1984). Teachers' status and power are reduced in not controlling what or how they will teach; when they become bureaucrats their authority vis-a-vis students and parents may be bolstered since they have a rational, efficient, uniform, and accountable curriculum which replaces the uncertainty of individually devised goals and methods. Students also have no power in this view of education. They are seen as needing skill knowledge and rules which they can apply automatically. Thus, both teachers and students are viewed as technicians, implementers of rules or policies devised elsewhere. The appeal of this appraoch is its scientific underpinnings, its claim to efficiently solving untractable motivation and learning problems (Tom 1984).

The Wholistic Image of Education

This fourth image of good education contrasts dramatically with the others, especially in the dimension of control over the curriculum. I use the term 'wholistic' because this view strives for contact with multiple facets of students, e.g. psychological, socioeconomic, cognitive, communicative, social, and develops a program to promote growth in a number of them. The image of wholistic education is drawn from studies of independent programs in comprehensive high schools for students likely to drop-out (Wehlage et al. 1982) and from the Foxfire curriculum (Wigginton 1985). Teachers in such programs work under different conditions, with students who are often viewed as hopeless by other teachers. Not all such programs are wholistic, but they do tend toward seeing education in this light.

The Curriculum. The curriculum of drop-out programs is often a grab-bag of things: meeting the regular requirements of math, English, science, and social studies for high school graduation mixed with therapy-type meetings, individualized progress, and experiential components. The fundamental

curriculum goal is for students to succeed in both academics and other realms of their lives; the approaches to such a goal are many but tend to emphasize processes over content. The content of courses is generally the same as for other high school classes, the methods employed involve individualization, cooperative learning, using real life problems to learn skills, and experiences in responsible positions such as day care, nursing homes, or other businesses. The flexibility in methods is seen as necessary to help students who have many problems, such as lack of self-esteem, difficult home lives, and patterns of school failure. Thus, the academic curricular knowledge that teachers transmit is the given knowledge of textbooks. However, because of the wholistic view of education, teachers also teach how to get along with people in authority, communication skills, and seek to inculcate values and moral direction.

The Teacher. Teachers in drop-out programs are the antithesis of subject mattter specialists. Wehlage et al. (1982) describe these teachers as creating "extended roles" for themselves: teachers, counselors, problem-solvers, therapists, parents, best friends. Not only does the teacher have an extended role vis-a-vis the students, but she/he also administers the programs, does public relations, and runs interference for their students when problems arise with other teachers or administrators. Teachers conceive of the program, develop the idea, establish its goals, recruit and choose students, control dismissals, make decisions about resources (e.g. space and staff), and often develop special courses. The teachers in these programs have real power; their authority stems from their initiative, resolution, ability to help difficult students, and thus, their 'specialness.' Often they are persons of extraordinary zeal and talent who integrate personal, social, psychological, moral, and academic learnings in their teaching.

The Students. Students are viewed as whole persons, not just as a learners or as receptacles for knowledge. They are seen as needing education across many domains of their lives, for it is understood that a person cannot study math if weighty personal or social problems dominate his or his consciousness. The different parts of their lives are seen as interwoven and teachers must simultaneously approach psychological, social, and academic (and perhaps others) if students are going to be helped to succeed. And students are believed to be capable of success; they are not seen as lazy or bad but rather in need of the right structure and support in order to succeed in a second try. Thus, a positive view of students reigns, in which teachers assume that "until proven otherwise all students can learn and become responsible" (Wehlage et al. 1982:179).

Distribution of Power. From this brief overview, it is clear that teachers in alternative programs for marginal students have much greater power to conceive, plan, implement, and evaluate teaching than is typical in large comprehensive schools. They are often exempt from bureaucratic rules because flexibility is necessary. They have some control over who is admitted and who continues. Some of these teachers coordinated academic courses and credit with physical projects such as building renovation. Thus, teachers had great autonomy coupled with great responsibility in their extended roles as administrators, teachers, parents, and best friends. They were free to seek creative solutions to problems which might otherwise stand in the way of program or student success. These teachers have great autonomy and self-imposed responsibility; they work well independently, wanting to create and implement a wholistic educational program for students with problems.

Although these distinct images of education may not exist in ideally differentiated ways, they are illustrative of real differences among secondary

teachers in views of the aims and methods of education. The different conceptions of curriculum, teacher, and student, and the concomitant distribution of power will clearly influence an individual teachers' idea of her/his job and what is involved in successful teaching. The wholistic teacher's conception of good teaching will not resemble that of the technical or discipline-centered teacher. Such fundamentally different assumptions and images must be understood in discussions of teacher engagement.

The next section investigates the possibilities likely to be created under each image of education. This section will facilitate conclusions about which images of education foster greater numbers of possibilities for positive interactions among teacher, students, and curriculum.

ENGAGEMENT UNDER DIFFERENT IMAGES OF EDUCATION

Discipline-centered education may downplay the equality of relations between teacher and students. Personal knowledge is less likely. Creativity may not flourish, but the development of a teacher's particular viewpoint on the subject may be fostered. The teacher's expertise lies in the subject-matter, not in pedagogy or relations with students. Thus, engagement in the teacher's relation to the organization of teaching may be the strongest in this image of education.

Process-oriented education will likely emphasize pedagogical practices to stimulate individual development. The organization of teaching may be less important in that curricular content is considered only in relation to ideas and processes that best promote individual intellectual growth. Such curricula may lack socio-political understandings or commitments. Relations with students could be quite good, though the interactions will be directed to academic development. Teachers working under this image of education may strive to understand their students' intellectual complexity, though probably

not the whole child in that the reference point is intellectual growth. In the process view of education, engagement is likely to be strongest in the areas of pedagogical processes and teacher-student relations.

Technical education is least likely to foster engagement in the overall organization of teaching, since teachers are consciously absent in planning. The teacher-student relation may diminish in importance and in engagement over time, if Lipsky's assertion that alienation from clients naturally increases in a bureaucratic setting. In this image of education, teachers are pressed to think of students not as individual human beings, but as test scores, for that becomes the most important way progress, i.e. learning, is evaluated (Little 1982; Boston Women's Teachers' Group 1983). In a prescribed, standardized curriculum, the second thoughts, the stream of new ideas, and the personal side of knowledge are likely to be excess baggage, crowded out of the classroom by increasing mandated elements. The technical image of education has the greatest likelihood of eroding teacher engagement.

The wholistic view is likely to have the most engaged teachers, the teachers who believe in their capacity to create possibilities with and for their students and whose actions attest to those beliefs. In the example of programs for at-risk students, teachers have autonomy and control over many aspects of their programs, so they can be flexible and creative. However, the high engagement may take its toll in teachers exhausting themselves after a few years of tackling such a broad set of responsibilities (Wehlage et al. 1982).

Engagement of teachers will take different forms depending upon the image of education that guides their work. Under some images, teachers will be engaged more with the curriculum and less with students. For a teacher operating within the process-oriented image of education, the individual

student's progress and problems is the main focus. The wholistic image of education can be seen as the most complex understanding of the dynamics of teaching and learning, and likely to lead to the greatest number of possibilities. But its web of understandings may be inaccessible to many teachers. Some images of education will likely lead to greater possibilities in the on-going interactions of a teacher, students, and curriculum. However, the specific ends of these different approaches must be examined in concrete instances. To the extent possible, I described the ideal image through specific examples.

SUMMARY

I have presented a broad conceptualization of teacher engagement, consciously avoiding a mechanistic, behaviorized definition that would further fuel the technical image of education, an image that the present review exposes as seductive in its clarity and standardization, but running a high risk of resulting in disengagement of teachers. I defined engagement as the creation of possibilities in the teaching-learning process. The creation of possibilities will vary with context and any evaluation of engagement must occur in particular settings with particular students and teachers. The creation of possibilities takes place through three main sub-processes, or sets of relations A) between teachers and students, B) among the teacher, students, and the curriculum, and C) between the teacher and the curriculum. I reviewed research on each of these three sub-processes and distilled a few recurring dimensions of engaged teachers in each area. When I compared the engagement processes with the four images of education, wholistic education seemed most likely to generate and renew engaged teachers. Given supportive students and a cooperative school district, the discipline-centered image of education could remain generative of possibilities. However, with students or

parents who value a technical education, such discipline-centered teachers face great hurdles in remaining engaged. Process-oriented education ranked high in the likelihood of fostering and maintaining engagement, although this image of education is curricularly underdeveloped. Techncial education appears least likely to be an image of education generative of engaged teachers, especially over time.

This review unearthed two unanticipated but important findings. First, in no image of education is thorough curriculum planning an important priority. The tendency across different approaches to education is to accept some form of curriculum as given (e.g. traditional disciplines or the textbook-as-curriculum), to establish isolatable skills as the proper end of education, or to make education content-independent as in the process-oriented approach. I would anticipate teacher engagement to be relatively undeveloped in relation to curriculum. This finding suggests that reform proposals with major components of curricular change (e.g. Sizer 1984) will meet great difficulty from teachers' conceptual simplicity (not to mention that of the general public) in this area.

A second unanticipated finding is the centrality of power in engagement. Without power, teachers can create few things. Without power, students are spiritless and disengaged. The fact that power is so central to different images of education is part of the explanation of why discipline-centered teaching is so entrenched (with its attendant teacher authority) and why administrators and educational experts are so keen on educational systems which accord them more and teachers less power. Educators who are really interested in enhancing teacher and student engagement must be attuned to the power struggles inherent in all educational agendas.

NOTES

[1]Within each of these perspectives educators can hold simple to complex views of the teacher's role, the curriculum, and students. Ammon et al. (1985) suggest that interviewees offer a range of understandings of each category. They found single-factor explanations of student behavior such as ability or motivational traits (e.g. "bright" or "lazy") to multifactor interactive explanations. Learning is seen most simply as the acquisition of specific facts, rules, attitudes resulting from exposure (Ammon et al. 1985:5); others view learning as meaning-making by the student in situations structured by the teacher to stretch both the cognitive processess and the factual bases of students' knowledge (op cit.:8). Studies of different levels of understanding have only been done for elementary teachers; however I would expect a spectrum of simple to complex understandings regardless of the basic orientation of the educator.

Ammon, P., Hutcheson, B. P., & Black, A.
(1985, April).
Teachers' developing conceptions about children, learning, and teaching: Observations from a clinical interview. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Ayers, W.
(1986, February).
About teaching and teachers. Harvard Education Review, 56(1), 49-51.

Bacharach, S. B., & Mitchell, M.
(1981, Fall).
Critical variables in the formation and maintenance of consensus in school districts. Educational Administration, pp. 74-97.

Bacharach, S. B., & Conley, S. C.
(1986, May).
Education reform: A managerial agenda. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 641-645.

Barton, L., Walker, S. (Eds.).
(1981).
Schools, teachers and teaching. Lewes, England: The Falmer Press.

Baxter, J., Richert, A., & Saylor, C.
(1985, April).
Science group: Content and process of biology. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Bernstein, B.
(1975).
Class, codes and control, Vol. 3. London: RKP.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H.
(1981).
Dilemmas of schooling. London: Methnen.

Boston Women's Teachers' Group.
(1983).
Teaching: An imperilled profession. In. L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L.
(1974).
Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Buchmann, M.
(1984).
The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. American Journal of Education, 92(4), 421-439.

Buchmann, M.
(1985, Spring).
Improving education by talking: Argument or conversation. Teacher's College Record, 86(3), 441-453.

Bullough, R. B., Jr., Goldstein, S. L., & Holt, L.
(1984).
Human interests in the curriculum. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, E. A., & Amarel, M.
(1976).
Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Cusick, P. A.
(1983).
The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Davies, L.
(1984).
Pupil power: Deviance and gender in school. London: The Falmer Press.

Dingwall, R.
(1977),
"Atrocity stories" and professional relationships. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 4(4).

Doyle, W.
(1983, Summer).
Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53(2), 159-200.

Eggleston, J. (Ed.).
(1979).
Teacher decision-making in the classroom. London: RKP.

Eisner, E., & Vallance, E.
(1974).
Conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Elbaz, F.
(1983).
Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. London: Croom Helm.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R.
(1985).
In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), The third handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Glick, O.
(1968).

The educational process in the classroom. School Review, 76, 339-51.

Gomez, M. L.
(1985).
The Wisconsin writing project: An exemplar of current efforts at planned school change through staff development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Grant, G.
(1983, Spring).
The teacher's predicament. Teachers College Record, 84(3), 593-609.

Gray, J., & Myers, M.
(1978).
The bay area writing project. Phi Delta Kappan, 59(6), 410-413.

Grossman, P., Reynolds, A., Ringstaff, C., & Sykes, G.
(1985, April).
English major to english teacher: New approaches to an old problem. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Associaton, Chicago, IL.

Gudmundsdottir, S., Cary, N., & Wilson, S.
(1985, April).
Role of prior subject matter knowledge in learning to teach social studies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hargreaves, A.
(1984, October).
Experience counts, theory doesn't: How teachers talk about their work. Sociology of Education, 57, 244-254.

Hargreaves, D. H.
(1980).
The occupational culture of teachers. In P. Woods, (Ed.). Teacher strategies. London: Croom Helm.

Jackson, P. W.
(1968),
Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B.
(1982, October).
The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership (pp. 4-10).

Keddie, N.
(1977).
Classroom knowledge. In A. A. Bellack, & H. M. Kliebard (Eds.), Curriculum and evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Lampert, M.
(1984).
Teaching about thinking and thinking about teaching. Journal of Curriculum

Studies, 16, 1-18.

Levin, H. M.
(1984, Summer).
About time for educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6(2), 151-163.

Lighfoot, S. L.
(1983).
The lives of teachers. In L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Lipsky, M.
(1980).
Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Little, J. W.
(1982).
Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Little, J. W.
(1984).
Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 84-102.

Lortie, D. C.
(1975).
School teacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. C.
(1986, April).
Teacher status in Dade county: A case of structural strain? Phi Delta Kappan, (pp. 568-575).

MacKay, R.
(1978).
How teachers know: A case of epistemological conflict. Sociology of Education, 51, 177-187.

McNeil, L. M.
(1983).
Defensive teaching and classroom control. In M. W. Apple, & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple.

Metz, M. H.
(1978).
Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Oakeshott, M.
(1972).

Education: The engagement and its frustration. In R. F. Dearden, P. H. Hirst, and R. S. Peters (Eds.), Education and the development of reason. London: RKP.

Popkewitz, T. S., Tabachnick, B. R., & Wehlage, G.
(1982).
The myth of educational reform. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K.
(1985).
The shopping mall high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Raphael, R.
(1985).
The teacher's voice: A sense of who we are. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Shulman, L. S.
(1983).
Autonomy and obligation: The remote control of teaching. In L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Shulman, L. S.
(1985, April).
The study of knowledge in teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Sizer, T. R.
(1984).
Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Sykes, G.
(1983).
Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Tom, A. R.
(1984).
Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Weber, M.
(1946).
H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Trans.). New York: Ozdford University Press. (Original work from Max Weber).

Wehlage, G., Stone, C., & Kliebard, H.
(1980).
Dropouts and schools. Madison, WI: Governor's Employment and Training Office.

Wehlage, G., Stone, C., Lesko, N., Nauman, C., & Page, R.
(1982).
Effective programs for the marginal high school student. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Wolcott, Harry F.
(1977).
Teachers vs. technocrats. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Woods, P. (Ed.).
(1980).
Teacher strategies. Londgon: Croom Helm.

Woods, P.
(1981).
Strategies, commitment and identity: Making and breaking the teacher role. In L. Barton, and S. Walker (Eds.), Schools, teachers and teaching. Sussex, England: The Falmer Press.

Young, R. E.
(1980).
The controlling curriculum and the practical ideology of teachers. Australian and New Zeland Journal of Sociology, 16(3).

Young, R. E.
(1981).
A study of teacher epistemologies. The Australian Journal of Education, 25(2), 194-208.

Young, R. E.
(1981, Summer).
The epistemic discourse of teachers: An ethnographic study. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12(2), 122-144.

Zeichner, K. M.
(1981-82).
Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Interchange, 12(4), 1-22.